**Independent Observer: Volume III**

# From Vietnam to Terry v. Ohio: Investing in Human Failure vs. Human Potential

Author: Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan

Affiliation: The Independent Observer

Date: October 2, 2025

Email: swardhan1@icloud.com

**ORCID ID: 0009-0005-4228-1124**

**SSRN Author ID: 7768604**

Keywords: Universal Basic Income, Terry v. Ohio, Vietnam Veterans, Mass Incarceration, Welfare State, Human Capital, Political Economy

JEL Codes: H55, I38, K42, P16

## Abstract

This paper examines how the United States has repeatedly monetized failure—from the neglect of Vietnam veterans to the expansion of mass incarceration after Terry v. Ohio (1968). Whereas the U.S. justice system and welfare bureaucracy have historically generated profit through punishment, auditing, and exclusion, alternative models from Finland and Canada demonstrate the viability of redirecting investment into human restoration. The proposed framework—treating human productivity as a stock-backed asset—offers a hybrid between welfare and capitalism. Veterans, the disabled, and structurally displaced workers would not be burdens but beneficiaries, generating measurable returns in reduced homelessness, lower incarceration costs, and higher productivity. America, long the "largest welfare state in the world" but lacking transparency, could reorient capital from punishment industries into dignity industries.

## 1. Introduction

The American political economy has long extracted value from human damage. Veterans abandoned after Vietnam, Black and brown communities targeted under stop-and-frisk, and the working poor entrapped by the carceral state—each became the raw material for a failure economy. This paper proposes an inversion: redirecting capital flow from punishment to rehabilitation.

## 2. Historical Context: Vietnam & Terry v. Ohio

Vietnam veterans often returned home dealing with PTSD, substance dependence, or disfigurement. Instead of receiving support for reintegration, many faced homelessness or incarceration. The 1968 ruling in Terry v. Ohio allowed police to stop and frisk individuals based on 'reasonable suspicion,' which lowered constitutional protections. This decision contributed to the rise of aggressive policing, the criminalization of poverty, and mass incarceration. Collectively, these histories reveal a system that profits from citizens' struggles rather than assisting them in rebuilding.

## 3. The Failure Economy

This paragraph discusses the various revenue streams generated by the criminal justice system and how politicians invest in certain corporations. It explains that revenue is earned through arrest fees, court costs, prison contracts, labor exploitation, surveillance technology, and welfare-related audits and enforcement. Additionally, it highlights that politicians often invest in companies benefiting from policing, prisons, and probation, emphasizing that this is a strategic investment approach rather than a conspiracy.

## 4. Comparative Case Studies: Finland & Canada

- Finland's 2017–2018 UBI pilot provided €560 per month as an unconditional income, which resulted in improved mental health, reduced anxiety, and a slight increase in employment. Similarly, Canada's Ontario Basic Income Pilot offered $17,000 CAD annually to individuals, leading to higher well-being and greater community participation prior to its cancellation. The key lesson from these pilots is that Universal Basic Income (UBI) can enhance stability without diminishing work incentives.

## 5. The U.S. Paradox: The Biggest Welfare State Without Transparency

America already operates the most extensive welfare system in history, including corporate subsidies, farm bills, military pensions, and tax loopholes that surpass direct aid to the poor. However, assistance for veterans, disabled citizens, and marginalized groups remains fragmented, stigmatized, and unclear. Additionally, corporations like Apple and SpaceX benefit significantly from publicly funded infrastructure, demonstrating that welfare underpins productivity.

## 6. Proposal: Human Productivity as Stock

- Universal Productivity Stock (UPS) is a regulated fund that invests in human restoration efforts. It supports both domestic and foreign investors who contribute to providing **baseline income for veterans, individuals with disabilities, and the structurally unemployed**. The fund's returns are generated from savings achieved through reduced incarceration rates, fewer emergency room visits, and decreased social breakdowns. The key measurable outcomes include a decline in homelessness, increased workforce re-

entry, and enhanced civic stability. The core principle of UPS is to profit from restoring human potential, rather than punishing human shortcomings.

**7. Policy Implications**

- Auditable, transparent, investor-backed. It’s not 'socialism,' but a form of capitalism that guarantees a minimum floor for investments. Pilot programs in states with many veterans, like Texas and Florida, can serve as models for potential returns. Politicians are motivated to shift investments from punitive industries to those focused on restoration.

**8. Conclusion**

From Vietnam to Terry v. Ohio, America has bet against its own people. Veterans, the disabled, and disfigured citizens were abandoned while politicians profited from incarceration stocks. A Universal Productivity Stock reframes dignity as equity—transforming welfare from a stigmatized bureaucracy into a regulated market of restoration. This is not utopian. It is a pragmatic correction: profit when people succeed, not when they fail.

**References**


1. Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).
2. Alexander, M. (2010). The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness. The New Press.
3. Kangas, O., et al. (2021). The Basic Income Experiment 2017–2018 in Finland. Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs.
4. Segal, H. (2019). Finding a Better Way: Basic Income Pilot in Ontario.
5. Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Harvard University Press.
6. Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. PublicAffairs.
7. Gilens, M., & Page, B. (2014). Testing Theories of American Politics. Perspectives on Politics.